

1963

is no better way to know and to understand the Government than to know where its money comes from and where it is spent.

All Members of this body have a sincere desire to act from an informed position upon the many issues which confront us. As I seek to understand the budget, I must say that the one-way streets and dead end streets, the detours, and the stop lights make the task far from easy. The budget document, while neatly assembled, is not always a helpful roadmap. I am sure the frustration I have experienced in this area is shared by many of my colleagues.

This condition—the size and the complexity of our Government and the size and complexity of our national budget—is worthy of our serious attention.

I would hope that as a result of the work of the proposed joint committee, we would have available data compiled independently of that furnished by witnesses and administering agencies. Often we are in the position of having to judge an issue based upon the evidence and the case submitted only by the proponents. Honorable as their intentions may be, we should not be compelled to rely upon only such evidence.

I would anticipate frequent evaluations of continuing programs. Very frequently we direct our analysis to programs which are new or call for increased funds, whereas programs with fairly constant fiscal demands are not as carefully scrutinized for value received or for their need to exist at all.

Certainly we need more realistic projections of the future cost of new programs. We are in the habit of starting a new program of nominal cost, only to find that the first appropriation is just "seed" money. These programs later return to us, and demand more support. We should know what we are getting into, and we should be in a position to provide to the administration guidance regarding our future intentions. This can be done by having available to the Congress and to the administration detailed projections, as part of our legislative record.

We should have available a realistic view of authorized spending. Each year we authorize vast programs. It may be that these authorizations are easily passed because it is understood that the actual appropriation of money is not involved. We assume that the appropriations process will protect the taxpayers. We need to have a better understanding of what we are committed to and of how real these obligations are.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these are a few of the very real needs which a joint committee on the budget and a competent staff will satisfy.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA AND THE EMERGING NATIONS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

MR. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the shortcomings of our current policy toward Africa and the emerging nations is contained in a recent article written

by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

In the blunt terms which are characteristic of the Senator, he maintains that "as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all."

No one can quarrel with that statement. Clearly, as Senator GOLDWATER suggests, now is the time for a fresh approach to the problem, and a rethinking, and perhaps discarding, of some of our outmoded notions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator GOLDWATER's "How Do You Stand, Sir?" column, distributed by the Los Angeles Times Syndicate for April 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Our entire African foreign policy needs a careful reexamination. For, as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all.

The United States opposes colonialism in Africa. Unquestionably, this is right in theory. But in practice, some unpleasant developments have arisen.

Since 1956, 27 new African countries have been admitted to the United Nations. Most of these are in economic trouble, despite aid from the European countries which formerly ruled them. Almost without exception, the economic situation in the new states has deteriorated. Moreover, the trend toward dictatorship and personal rule is marked, as the personal extravagance and inflationary policies of many of the rulers and their entourages have been.

Equally disturbing is the nationalism and extremism in most of the new states. Anti-European sentiment is strong and seems to be rising all over Africa.

Kenya, the British colony, is not yet free, but already the white farmers are leaving. The chances are heavy that their property will be expropriated.

Freedom for the Belgian Congo was followed by outbreaks of violence which resulted in atrocities and murders and destruction of property. The exodus of the Europeans which followed that declaration of independence is one reason for the sorry state in which the Congo finds itself today.

There is such a thing as freedom too soon. This is exemplified in the Belgian Congo and in some other states as well. The Belgians claim we put pressure on them to get out of the Congo, and now it is fully apparent that the Congo was not ready to run its own affairs. Informed leaders claim the chaos there is likely to continue for a number of years.

Meanwhile, the United States has committed itself to back the Congo Government. Already we have put many millions of dollars into the country, one way or another. The total sum in 1962 was over \$200 million. We will, of course, give the Congo much more before we are through.

Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, is openly supporting a movement to drive the Portuguese out of the nearby Province of Angola. He has donated land for a camp which is training troops for an invasion of Angola. The men are being supplied with arms by Ben Bella, the Algerian leader who pledged his support to Castro right after he visited the United States to engage in foreign aid talks.

If we permit Adoula to carry out his plans, it will amount to our assisting an attack on

the Portuguese, since we are Adoula's principal backer. And because Angola is no more ready for self-government than was the Congo, the eviction of the Portuguese from that Province will simply give us one more country to support.

Many of the new African States are too small to be viable. Others lack the necessary resources. Experts say there are only about five states with the area and resources required to permit them to take care of themselves. These are Nigeria, the Congo, Ghana, Tanganyika, and the Sudan. But these sorely need the technical and administrative skills of the whites, as do the other new African nations.

Today, the drive against colonialism in Africa continues unabated. As it moves into South Africa, it encounters increasing resistance. The problems multiply and increase in size.

So, I suggest, the time has come for us to take stock of our policies. Perhaps the time has come to try out some basis for cooperation between whites and natives before we insist that the whites abdicate entirely, for it has become obvious that a satisfactory working relationship between the races is necessary for any real African progress. Our present policy is not providing such a relationship.

How do you stand, sir?

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these days when big government seems to be steadily growing bigger, many of us are concerned to know just how the role of government in our life is to be defined. There would appear to be no better definition than that given by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in his speech before the "Forum of the Future," at Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, April 25, 1963.

Taking his cue from the West Virginia State motto, "Mountaineers Are Always Free," the Vice President described government as mankind's most powerful—and most fallible—creation. As developed by freemen, it is and must always remain a servant of the people. Better government, he pointed out, not simply more government, is our aim. The success of our Union is due, Vice President JOHNSON said, to the fact that it has never attempted to exert any power other than that granted to it freely at the polls.

Reviewing the jealous guarding of freedom in the Mountain State's first 100 years, the Vice President boldly envisioned the role of government in the next 100 years as a four-pronged instrument for achieving social progress by means of education, exploration of space, expansion of our economy, and conservation of natural resources.

Because the role of government is such an important question in all of our minds today, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

One hundred years ago—on June 20, 1863—the State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union. In that year, the soil of our land

with tragic blood as American fought American as an outgrowth of their differences over what the role of government should be. The topic assigned to me for this "Forum of the Future" has been, and continues to be—the most controversial, the most divisive, and the most nearly continuous issue of our national life from the Continental Congress to the present.

Whether we speak of the Nation, of an individual State, or of any of the local areas served by the 91,000 constituted governments of our land, we cannot look into the future and say with confidence what the role of government will be 100 years, 10 years or even 1 year hence. This question is answered anew each time the people vote. This process is one of the great sources of strength of our system—and of our freedoms.

Government is mankind's most powerful invention. It is also among the least perfect and most fallible of his works. Many more governments have failed than have succeeded. Our own—still less than 200 years old—has outlived virtually every government which existed at the time of its formation, largely because of the constant scrutiny it received—at all levels—by people jealous of their liberties.

This spirit has a long history in West Virginia. Inhabitants of these mountains petitioned the British Crown for self-government long before the Colonies declared their independence. West Virginians have given more than lipservice to the slogan, "Mountaineers Are Always Free."

The American view toward government was well expressed more than 100 years ago in a story related by the writer and philosopher, Henry Thoreau. In his Journal, Thoreau related this personal experience: "I went to the store the other day to buy a bolt for our front door, for as I told the storekeeper, the Governor was coming here. 'Aye,' said he, 'And the legislature, too.' Then, I will take two bolts," said I. He said that there had been a steady demand for bolts and locks of late, for our protectors were coming."

(Of course, I trust the Governor and the members of the legislature who are present will bear in mind that Thoreau did not have the privilege of living in West Virginia.)

I believe the point is made. When we consider the question of the role of government, we consider the question which has provoked the strongest feelings of Americans through the years—and we establish the one fact which underlies our discussion here. That is the fact that for the next 100 years, the role of government in West Virginia—and in the Nation—will be determined by the will of the people themselves.

As Governor of the State of New York, a very great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said more than 30 years ago: "The duty of the state toward its citizens is the duty of the servant to its master."

Our present debates on the role of government are obsessed with issues of size and cost. Some regard big government as an end in itself. Others believe big government is an evil in itself. The many details of these debates are unlikely soon to be settled. If we have settled on any national consensus about the role of government, however, it is upon the concept of government as servant—rather than as master.

Government is not made benevolent or tyrannical by its smallness or its bigness. The decisive test is performance. Government is good—or it is not good—in proportion as it performs what the people need it to perform: neither less nor more, neither too little nor too much.

In the earlier years of this century, Samuel Gompers, when asked what labor wanted, answered with a single word: "More." If many Americans today were asked what they wanted of government, their instinct might be to answer: "Less."

But big government is a fact of our national life. In 1929, the transactions of government—Federal, State, and local—represented less than 10 percent of our gross national product. At the start of this decade, such transactions accounted for nearly 30 percent. We cannot dismiss this size, the rate of growth, or the broad implications of the relationship of governmental policies to our whole economy and society. But we can insist—we must insist—that the very dimensions of government's present role be accompanied by better performance as our servant.

In the century of West Virginia's statehood, we have evolved the concept that if government is to be the faithful and effective servant of the people, its first—and foremost—service must be to the people's future. A responsible concern for the future has been a distinguishing characteristic of government in America. This concern has been expressed in four principal areas of activity: exploration, expansion, education, and conservation.

From the expedition of Lewis and Clark to the orbital flight of John Glenn, American government has been distinguished by an intelligent willingness to support and encourage exploration and discovery.

From the Homestead Act of 1862 to the incentives of the Revenue Act of 1962, American Government has concerned itself with stimulating expansion for both individuals and businesses. As early as 1787, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the support of education, American Government has honored a commitment to the future through a commitment to the education of our young.

Since the earliest years of this century, American Government—both Federal and State—has prudently assumed responsibility for conservation of our endowment of natural resources—and, in this prudent tradition, Government has undertaken a parallel responsibility to conserve and utilize more fully our human resources.

While we cannot prophesy far into the future what future generations will want the role of Government to be, I believe we can expect—and predict—continuation of these principal directions of public policy and governmental responsibility.

What will be the meaning for West Virginia?

The Mountain State, 100 years ago, elected to cast its lot with the Union. That decision then is symbolic for today. The future of West Virginia is inseparable from the future of the Union as a whole. Yet, in saying this, I realize that West Virginians may justifiably ask if this is so of the future, why has it not been so of the present and the immediate past.

In times of virtually universal American prosperity and growth, West Virginia has not shared equally in the national advance. The number of jobs has dwindled. Farm income has declined for your 43,000 farms. The number of businesses has decreased to 25,000. Income per capita has fallen to less than 80 percent of the national average.

In this regard, I was interested to find—to my surprise—that despite these trends, there are twice as many persons in West Virginia owning and holding stocks on the New York Stock Exchange than in my own State of Texas.

The experiences of recent years might justify West Virginians adopting the philosophy of Mr. Dooley, who said: "Anyhow, there is always one ray of light ahead—we're sure to have hard times."

While such a philosophy might seem justified, at this start of West Virginia's centennial observance, we neither accept such an attitude nor believe it. On the contrary, we view the future from an exactly opposite per-

spective. As a nation, we accept as our responsibility the proposition that Americans of every State must be sure of good times ahead.

The fate which has befallen West Virginia in recent years was not determined within the borders of your State. It was determined by events and forces in other States, in the entire Nation, and even in the world.

Developments in our own Southwest and the distant Middle East—developments as near as the coal markets of the mid-Atlantic and as far as the Common Market of Europe—had their consequences and effect upon the enterprise, the jobs, the homes and, finally, even the food on the plates of West Virginians.

The people of the United States have, through the policies of their Government, made a commitment to the individual and his well being. In the lesson of West Virginia, we have learned that Government cannot meet this commitment merely by being ready to write a check. Government must perform more than the role of an automated charity.

In this interdependent world, good times for the individual American can only be assured as individual human beings throughout the world enjoy better times for themselves.

West Virginia's per capita income is, as I have mentioned, below the average of all States. But at the level of about \$1,800 annually, the income of West Virginians compares as the wealth of millionaires to the income of most of the earth's population.

In only six nations, including our own, is the income level over \$1,000 a year. In only a few others does it exceed \$500 a year. Most of the world's population lives for a year on no more than a single weekly paycheck of an American industrial worker.

We have learned in this 20th century that we could not isolate ourselves from military aggressors of the world. Today, we are learning—or ought to be learning—that we cannot isolate ourselves or the domestic economy from the aggressors of poverty or privation in the world. Either the living standards of the world must rise toward ours or our own standards will fall toward those of the world.

One of the lessons we have learned in West Virginia applies also to the world. We have learned that America cannot assure better times for the world merely through the use of our checkbook.

Vastly more is required of responsible government than that it be a checkwriting machine. The standards of government—whether its relative size be large or small—demand able and courageous performance in the four realms I have mentioned: exploration, expansion, education and conservation.

In the next 100 years, government's role in these areas will be active and important. The objective of all that is done will be to improve life for the individual here on earth.

We explore space. Our objective is far more than to reach the moon. Our space effort will require the fullest use of our resources, bringing new and higher uses for the natural wealth of West Virginia, creating better jobs and higher paying jobs for your people and the people of all the States. But the fruits of our space technology will open opportunity worldwide.

We seek to foster expansion—expansion of industry, the building of plants, the expansion of research and distribution. But even more, we seek expansion of the good life for all our people—the building of better homes, increasing profitability of farms, opening new doors of opportunity to all people regardless of race, religion or national origin.

We seek to foster conservation. We must continue the prudent preservation of our

1938

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 6

Why do we bring up the Edsel?

Because we are certain that Mr. McNamara, if he had been Ford president at that time, never would have committed his company's future to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as Secretary of Defense, he apparently has no qualms about committing his Nation's future to a single design concept.

As we study the philosophy of Defense Research and Engineering, we find men of high intelligence taking a highly unintelligent approach to the weapon systems which this Nation will need in the future. They seem convinced that until it can be proven absolutely that a total system will work, until all question-marks are answered, until all risks are eliminated, no go-ahead should be given for development of a given project. Once committed to that philosophy of certainty, it is only a brief step to the belief that you need only one design. If you are so certain the first will work, why build two?

Show paper proposals to a scientist and he can assure you, after study, that one is more likely to succeed than another. Show them to an engineer and he'll tell you that the best way to find out is to build both of them and test them.

The dangers in our defense organization today lie in the fact that the heavily scientific organization of Defense Research and Engineering is making decisions that more practical engineers would decline to make without testing of hardware.

Today, as we have pointed out before, three-fourths of the new projects under study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff come down from D.D.R. & E.—a complete reversal of previous years when proposals flowed largely from the more practical minds of men in the military and industry.

We are told that the new single-design approach is necessary because weapon systems today are so costly that we cannot afford to embark on two parallel projects. We say the reverse is true; we cannot afford to abandon dual approaches—due to the simple fact that once wholly committed to the wrong road it becomes impossible to turn back because of the sheer size of the financial outlay already made. The cost of today's projects makes it imperative that dual approaches be explored before commitment to the entire weapons system.

Why not explore both Gemini and Dyna-Soar technology? Why not explore two TFX prototypes? No one can say now that one approach or another will be the successful one—paper studies just won't do the job.

There would be no problem, of course, if we had an infallible man as Secretary of Defense, one who could count on his advisers always to give him the correct advice and one who could always make the right decision.

Let's turn back the pages of recent aviation history and muse on what a single design approach might have done for the Nation's well-being.

Turn back to the days just before World War II. Paper proposals for two fighter planes are being studied by Defense Research and Engineering.

"It is quite apparent," says a high Defense official, "that we don't need both these fighter aircraft. One will do. Cancel the P-38. We'll build only the P-39."

A few weeks later, more proposals are laid on his desk.

"Why should we go into two costly bomber programs?" he asks. "Cancel the B-17. We'll build only the B-24."

Months pass. "Cancel the E-51," he says. "We'll build only the P-47."

We leave to those with more imagination the ruminations on what course World War II might have taken if we had been forced to fight it without the P-38, P-51, and B-17. The Nation certainly might have saved a

great deal of money and won the war quite handily, of course, if we had possessed a high Defense official who unerringly could have selected the P-38, P-51, and B-17 and canceled the less successful alternatives. No such man existed then and none exists today.

We always will have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Migs swept down across the Yalu.

When it comes to military weapons, this Nation cannot afford to guess. We must explore all alternative approaches to the furthest point in hardware that we possibly can afford. We must not let fallible men make irrevocable decisions.

We hope Mr. McNamara remembers the Edsel.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate, S. 357, will provide for a more effective evaluation of budget requirements of executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Both historically and legally, one of the major functions of Congress—if not our most important single one—is that of controlling Federal spending and taxing, and the financial policies of the Government.

Yet I do not believe we are performing that function adequately today. In passing on Federal appropriations, we proceed primarily on the basis of the proposals made to us by the President, rather than creating our own policy guides. The initiative is left with the President, although theoretically Congress has the power to control. Furthermore, even when it comes to passing on the details of appropriations for each program and bureau, we rely largely on the analysis and data presented to us by the agency itself and by the administration's Budget Bureau, rather than developing our own material.

The bill S. 537, which would establish a joint congressional Committee on the Budget, is intended to repair that situation by providing us with the means for doing our own analysis of requested appropriations, of preparing our own material on the budget, and developing our own policies to control Federal financial policies. The proposed joint committee would have a small staff to carry on the kind of study and analysis to which reference is made. As I envisage it, this joint committee would operate in a manner similar to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which provides expert technical assistance to both the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees.

It is recognized that at present both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees have highly efficient staffs, but in practice the men on those staffs must necessarily devote full time to the processing of the particular appropriation bills to which they are assigned. The staff of the proposed new joint committee would have time to carry on studies of longer range and broader scope, including those which cut across individual appropriation bills.

Creation of this new joint committee would not be a radical departure from the kind of arrangement Congress has

already created with respect to other matters. Furthermore, it would not infringe on the prerogatives of either House, since the joint committee and its staff would remain firmly under the control of members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Spending has skyrocketed in the last few years. For fiscal year 1962, President Eisenhower requested new obligatory authority of about \$81 billion. For fiscal year 1964, we have been asked to approve new obligatory authority amounting to \$108 billion. This is an increase of \$27 billion or 33 1/3 percent in the short span of 2 calendar years.

I submit that Congress is obligated to improve its machinery for coping with administration requests for appropriations, if we are seriously to claim that we control the purse strings of the Government. Enactment of Senate bill 537 will be an effective step for improvement in this regard.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments made by the senior Senator from Nebraska concerning Senate bill 537. I wish to associate myself with his views, and to make a comment on that subject.

Mr. President, the cosponsorships of Senate bill 537 by 77 Members of the Senate indicates that the merits of this bill are generally recognized. A long discussion of it by a new cosponsor is, therefore, unnecessary. Nevertheless, I wish to take the occasion to comment on the chief sponsor of the bill and to make a brief observation on the proposition before us.

I am persuaded that the Senate and the Nation owe the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] a vote of deep appreciation for his constant and consistent support of the cause of an effective Congress. His efforts since 1950 to secure the enactment of this particular bill typify his determination to accomplish that which he believes is right and necessary.

Mr. President, regardless of whether our colleagues at the south end of the Capitol see fit to pass this measure this year or in a subsequent year, we have a clear obligation again to make an expression on this matter.

On the bill itself, I should like to make one point which in my judgment justifies enactment of the bill: If Congress is to remain a constructive, effective, and coequal branch of our National Government, Congress must exercise an informed and independent judgment concerning the volume, the direction, and the priority of our national efforts. The most effective participation this branch possesses is in connection with its ability and its duty to control the flow of money to the administrative agencies. Our best intentions will not be satisfied, nor will the Nation's interests be served, if we cannot assure proper utilization of the vast financial resources which we siphon from the pocketbooks of the citizens and redirect through Government programs.

I have heard it said that the best way to learn one's way around a strange city is to drive a taxicab. In similar manner, I suggest the best way to learn one's way around Government is to try to trace what happens to the tax dollars. There

1963

City on March 20, and continued to come until April 22; the peak of the load was about April 13.

Temporary employees for this stamp issue 22 persons were employed as extra help. The total payroll for these employees was \$1,499. First day sales in Nebraska City, 640,000 2-cent stamps, 279,409 pieces of mail matter went through the special canceling machine, 1,151 pieces special delivery mail, 51,000 airmail letters, and 810 pieces registered mail. All this required 59 pouches, these being dispatched on the holiday, April 22. Total money orders paid, 8,150, in amounts from 2 cents up. Our money order accounts were not completed until May 30. The total number of Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps printed was 66,182,900, being sold over the United States the day after the issue in Nebraska City.

The Arbor Day stamp bears the picture of Ruth and Alvin Hall, Jr., children of Alvin Hall, employed in the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D.C. When it was necessary to furnish subject matter for the Arbor Day stamp, Hall's children consented to pose for it. It portrays the children planting a Japanese cherry tree in front of their Washington home. The engraver slightly altered the original photograph in order to make the picture suitable for stamp engraving.

On the day of the celebration, members of the Morton family came to Nebraska City as the honored guests. First guest to call at the post office of the Morton family, were Mrs. Carl Morton, city, and her daughter, Mrs. Martha Morton Lattner, and daughter, Dubuque, Iowa. Mr. and Mrs. Joy Morton, his son, J. Sterling Morton and his son, Joy Morton 2d, and Betty Morton, granddaughter, all from Chicago, came to the office later in the morning. I escorted all the guests through the post office and explained to them the handling of mail. Mr. Joy Morton displayed a keen interest in the affair and he and his son asked questions and commented on the large amount of foreign mail. The party spent about an hour around the office and on leaving, Mr. Joy Morton complimented me on the success of the event.

Weather conditions were very favorable on the holiday. A large crowd came to the city and attended the tree planting ceremonies at Arbor Lodge and visited scenes of interest in the city. Many visitors from over the State were here.

The day closed with a banquet at Memorial Building attended by about 500 people.

The Morton family being guests of honor and naturally the center of interest, with Mr. T. W. McCullough, editor of the Omaha Bee-News, as speaker of the evening. His address was long, of the formal type, so a little tiresome to some listeners.

The interesting talk of the evening was by Mr. Joy Morton, who spoke reminiscently of the family during their residence here and some events of his boyhood days here. His son, J. Sterling Morton 2d, followed with a brief address.

ALBUMS OF RECORDS MADE BY FOUR U.S. MILITARY BANDS

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. President, in the May 1963 issue of Footlight, the National Cultural Center's newsletter, attention is drawn to the record albums recently made by the four U.S. military bands. The proceeds from the sale of these records will go to benefit the National Cultural Center.

As Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of the Cultural Center, pointed out in Footlight, the pressing of these records

represents unique cooperation among widely diverse groups, including the RCA Victor Record Division of the Radio Corp. of America, the Department of Defense, the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Television Artists, leading music composers, arrangers and publishers, the personnel of the military bands, and the people associated with the Cultural Center.

The selections included in the albums represent the standard songs which have become integral parts of our American musical heritage. The records will be a worthwhile addition to any music lover's collection, and the sale of the records will give every American the opportunity to make his or her contribution toward making the National Cultural Center a reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the May 1963 edition of Footlight, including the remarks of President Kennedy, recipient of the first pressings of the albums.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE BAND RECORDINGS

On May 1, recordings made by the four U.S. military bands—Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—went on sale to the public. This is the first time such recordings have been commercially available. On April 23, the first pressings of the albums were presented to President Kennedy in his office at the White House. Making the presentation were George R. Marek, vice president of RCA Victor Records, Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, National Cultural Center, and the four conductors: Lt. Col. Hugh Curry, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Anthony Mitchell, U.S. Navy; and Capt. Harry H. Meuser, U.S. Air Force, for Col. George S. Howard, who was ill.

In accepting the records, the President said, "I want to express my appreciation to RCA for having made these recordings which, I understand, are unusually well done. I understand that the National Cultural Center will receive 95 cents on each album, and it will be a great help to the Center."

"In addition, I am very grateful to the Musicians' Union, which has waived all its interests and rights in this matter. This is the first time that the American military bands have gone into this area, and it has been done because of the strong feeling by the industry and by the union that the Cultural Center will serve the country as well as the performing arts."

"Most of all we are grateful to our country's military bands—the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—for recording the albums. I hope that everyone buys them. It will give people a chance to hear great band music and to make a contribution to the development of the Cultural Center, which belongs to Washington, which is part of the Nation. I will enjoy playing the records myself."

DESIGN AND PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, imagine the following situation:

Robert S. McNamara points his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?"

he asks. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replies. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," says Mr. McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

That conversation, of course, never took place. But it is used as the lead of a thoughtful editorial in the April 29 issue of Missiles and Rockets to make the point that as the president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. McNamara would never have committed that company to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as William J. Coughlin points out in the editorial aptly titled, "The Fallible Man," as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara seems to have no qualms about committing this Nation's future to a single design concept.

The editorial asks the question of what would have happened in World War II "if we had canceled the B-17 and built only the B-24; if we had canceled the P-51 and built only the P-47."

Mr. Coughlin writes:

We will always have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian MiGs swept down across the Yalu.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "The Fallible Man," published in the April 29, 1963, issue of Missiles and Rockets.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALLIBLE MAN

Robert S. McNamara pointed his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asked. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replied. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," said McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

Secretary of Defense McNamara will be the first to assure you that no such conversation ever took place. If it had, the Ford Motor Co. today would be a financial shambles. Edsel was a dismal failure. Yet the project had been thoroughly analyzed by some of the finest minds in the automotive business and given the go-ahead by the management of one of the most successful firms in the industry. These experienced businessmen, operating in a familiar environment, were whipped by the unknowns.